

-13-

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the originally filed Drawings with enclosed set of replacement Drawings.

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed August 9, 2007, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this Application, Applicant submits the following remarks, has canceled claims and has added new claims. The claims as now presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 1-34 were pending in this Application. By this Amendment, claims 26-33 have been canceled. Applicant expressly reserves the right to prosecute at least some of the canceled claims and similar claims in one or more related Applications. Claims 35-38 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-25 and 34-38 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 4, 18, and 34 are independent claims.

Election/Restriction

The Office Action contends that claims 1-25 and 34 (Group I) were drawn to mitigating interference among communication signals from a first pair of interconnections and second pair of interconnections, classified in class 375, subclass 285. The Office Action further contends that claims 26-33 (Group II) were drawn to mitigating interference by selecting one of the combinations of communication filters from the different combinations of communication filters, classified in class 375, subclass 229.

The Office Action references a prior telephone conversation with Applicant's Representative, David E. Huang, Esq., in which Mr. Huang elected Group 1 without traverse. Applicant hereby affirms the election of Group 1 without traverse, namely, claims 1-25 and 34.

Objection to the Drawings

The original Drawings were objected to due to a few minor informalities. Applicant has provided a set of replacement Drawings to cure the objection. In

the replacement Drawings, Fig. 2 now reads “X2= -X”, and Fig. 3 now reads “X2= X”. No new matter has been added.

Objection to the Specification

The Specification was objected to due to a minor informality in the original Abstract. To cure this informality, Applicant has provided a replacement Abstract on an attached sheet. Accordingly, the objection to the Specification should now be withdrawn.

Allowed Claims

Claims 4-25 and 34 have been allowed.

Rejections under §112, first paragraph

The Office Action has asserted that claim 1 contains subject matter which was not described in the Specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the Application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Office Action expressed concern over the phrase “---to mitigate among other communication signals---” in claim 1.

Applicant disagrees with this contention. Nevertheless, to further the prosecution of this Application, Applicant has made a clarifying amendment to claim 1 to clearly and unambiguously indicate that the method of claim 1 includes conveying the non-differential mode communication signal on the first pair of interconnects to mitigate interference between the non-differential mode communication signal and another communication signal. This feature is described in the Specification, for example, on page 15, lines 5-16.

For the reasons stated above, the subject matter of claim 1 is described in the Specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the Application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under

-16-

§112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn, and claim 1 is now in allowable condition.

Claims 2 and 3 are dependent on claim 1. Based on the amendment to claim 1 previously indicated, Applicant believes these claims to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 35-38 have been added and are believed to be in allowable condition. Claims 35 and 36 depend from claim 4. Claims 37 and 38 depend from claim 18. Support for claims 35-38 is provided within the Specification, for example, on page 15, line 17 through page 15, line 18. No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, this Application should be in condition for allowance. A Notice to this affect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this Amendment, that the Application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants' Representative at the number below.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this Amendment, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3661.

-17-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-2900, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/David E. Huang/

---

David E. Huang, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 39,229  
Bainwood, Huang & Associates, L.L.C.  
Highpoint Center  
2 Connector Road  
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581  
Telephone: (508) 616-2900  
Facsimile: (508) 366-4688

Attorney Docket No.: 1004-131

Dated: August 31, 2007